

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Vurginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	T	
09/889,977	01/04/2002		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
	01/04/2002	Johannes Cornelis Blonk	F7453(V)	4398
201	7590 10/22/200	· ·	EVAN	n me
UNILEVER			EXAMINER	
PATENT DEF			BECKER, DREW E	
45 RIVER ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
EDGEWATE	NJ 07020		1761	THE ENTHUMBER
			DATE MAILED: 10/22/2004	L

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/889,977	BLONK ET AL.
January Cammary	Examiner	Art Unit
The MAILING DATE of this communication on	Drew E Becker	1761
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with t	he correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply of within the statutory minimum of thirty (30 will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS	be timely filed) days will be considered timely. from the mailing date of this communication
Status		
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 Al</u> 2a)□ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This 3)□ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.	prosecution as to the merits is
Disposition of Claims	A parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11	, 453 O.G. 213.
4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceed applicant may not request that any objection to the discrepance of the discr	election requirement. pted or b) objected to by the rawing(s) be held in abeyance. So	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign p a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents in the priori	have been received. have been received in Applica y documents have been received. PCT Rule 17 2(a))	tion No /ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/3/07 3. Patent and Trademark Office	6)	/ (PTO-413) late Patent Application (PTO-152)
TOL-326 (Rev. 1-04) Office Action	n Summany	Part of Paper No /Mail Data 1004

Art Unit: 1761

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Group II will also be examined.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: it lacks section headings such as "Summary of the Invention".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 5. Claim 1, line 6 recites "a springiness... comparable with that of cooked untreated rice". It is not clear what level of "springiness" would be considered "comparable".
- 6. Claim 1, line 8 recites "sothat". This should be changed to "so that".
- 7. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 11-12, 15-16, 18, 20-21 recite "preferably". It is not clear which range is being claimed.
- 8. Claim 1, line 15 recites "a firmness... comparable with that of cooked untreated rice". It is not clear what level of "firmness" would be considered "comparable".

Application/Control Number: 09/889,977

Art Unit: 1761

Page 3

- 9. Claim 3 recites "the surface of the cross-section **consists** of pores". It is not clear how a surface can be made of only open spaces, such as pores.
- 10. Claim 5 recites "a few holes". It is not clear how many holes would be considered a "few".
- 11. Claim 5, line 15 recites "it" It is not clear what "it" is.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 13. Claims 1-17, 19, and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Greethead [Pat. No. 4,478,862].

Greethead teaches a method of making a rice product with a microporous structure (column 2, line 60), a preparation time of less than 8 minutes (column 1, line 15), a lack of grittiness, a normal density of 0.8-0.85 kg/l (column 3, line 1), a final density of 0.3-0.6 kg/l (column 3, line 6), a lack of broken kernels, milled or polished rice (column 1, line 9), heat treatment in an annular, fluidized, swirling, toroidal bed (Figure 1, #1-3), a lack of transverse crack and holes greater than 500 microns, the air being at 100-600°C (column 3, line 40), a treatment time of 2-30 seconds (column 2, line 54), a starting water content of 13% (column 6, line 10), and recirculating gas (Figure 1, #16).

Properties such as "springiness", "pore distribution", "colour", "cracks", "rim", and

Application/Control Number: 09/889,977

Art Unit: 1761

"internal sponge" would have inherently been possessed by the product of Greethead due to the use of identical materials and method steps.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 15. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greethead as applied, in view of Wayne [Pat. No. 3,085,013].

Greethead teaches the above mentioned concepts as well as an air blower (column 4, line 11). Greethead does not recite the rotational speed of the blower, namely at less than 50 Hz, or an air velocity of less than 25 m/s. Wayne teaches a method of heating rice in a fluidized bed of air moving at 10.7-61 m/s (column 3, line 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the air speed of Wayne into the invention of Greethead since both are directed to methods of heating rice, since Greethead already included a fluidized bed of air (Figure 1, #1-3), and since air moving at 10.7-61 m/s was commonly used for heating rice, as shown by Wayne (column 3, line 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to operate the blower of Greethead, in view of Wayne, at less than 50 Hz since this speed would have been attempted during the course of normal experimentation, since Greethead simply does

Art Unit: 1761

not state what speed was used, and since Wayne already teaches using air at 10.7-61 m/s (column 3, line 10).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Drew E Becker whose telephone number is 571-272-1396. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thur. 8am-5pm and every other Fri. 8am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Drew E Becker Primary Examiner Art Unit 1761